

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 8/13/04, Applicant is submitting this amendment. Claims 18, 19, 30, 31, 46 and 48 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-17, 20-29, 32-45 and 47 are still pending.

In the Office Action mailed 8/13/04, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-18, 20-29, 32-45 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (U.S. Patent 6,467,002) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6,571,306). The Examiner cites Yang for teaching arbitration and Smith for disclosing distributed arbitration in which each bus master sees all bus requests and determines whether or not it has priority to take control of the bus.

With the currently amended claims, Applicant maintains that the earlier presented argument as to Yang still applies. That is, Yang discloses a centralized arbiter determining the arbitration for the devices requesting arbitration of the shared resource. The embodiments of the present invention, as recited in the amended claims, claim a distributed arbiter and not a centralized arbiter. The claimed distributed arbiter maintains order of priority in relation to other agents arbitrating for the bus and determines if the respective agent wins arbitration. The winner of the arbitration notifies to the other agents in a transaction that includes an agent identifier of the arbitration winner.

In respect to Smith, a distributed arbitration scheme is disclosed in which a client parked on a bus is allowed to gain access to the bus without having to go through arbitration. Even though each bus master sees all bus requests and determine whether or not it has priority to take control of the bus, Smith fails to disclose the transmission of an agent identifier sent with a transaction initiated by the agent winning the arbitration. The agent identifier from the winner of the arbitration notifies to the distributed arbiters which agent has won arbitration. By sending the winning agent's agent identifier with the transaction on a bus, each arbiter need only determine it's priority with respect to those

other agents seeking arbitration of the bus. Each agent need not determine which agent actually wins the arbitration, since this information is sent on the bus by the winning agent to notify the other agents as to the actual winner of the arbitration. These features as noted in the independent claims are not disclosed in Yang and Smith.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdrawal the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and further requests for the allowance of pending claims 1-17, 20-29, 32-45 and 47, as amended.

Since November 13, 2004, is on a Saturday, this response is being mailed on Monday, November 15, 2004, and still within the shortened statutory period of three months. However, if there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON, LLP  
(Customer No. 34,399)

Date: 11-15-04

By: William W. Kidd  
William W. Kidd  
Reg. No. 31,772  
Phone: (512) 263-1842  
Fax No: (512) 263-1469  
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 C.F.R 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date below:

11-15-04  
Date

William W. Kidd  
Signature